


UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL
on
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION



IN RE: MCKINSEY & COMPANY, INC., NATIONAL
PRESCRIPTION OPIATE CONSULTANT
LITIGATION

MDL No. 2996

(SEE ATTACHED SCHEDULE)


CONDITIONAL TRANSFER ORDER (CTO –35)

On June 7, 2021, the Panel transferred 17 civil action(s) to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407. *See* 543 F.Supp.3d 1377 (J.P.M.L. 2021). Since that time, 132 additional action(s) have been transferred to the Northern District of California. With the consent of that court, all such actions have been assigned to the Honorable Charles R. Breyer.

It appears that the action(s) on this conditional transfer order involve questions of fact that are common to the actions previously transferred to the Northern District of California and assigned to Judge Breyer.


Pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the Rules of Procedure of the United States Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation, the action(s) on the attached schedule are transferred under 28 U.S.C. § 1407 to the Northern District of California for the reasons stated in the order of June 7, 2021, and, with the consent of that court, assigned to the Honorable Charles R. Breyer.

This order does not become effective until it is filed in the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. The transmittal of this order to said Clerk shall be stayed 7 days from the entry thereof. If any party files a notice of opposition with the Clerk of the Panel within this 7-day period, the stay will be continued until further order of the Panel.



FOR THE PANEL:

John W. Nichols
Clerk of the Panel



**IN RE: MCKINSEY & COMPANY, INC., NATIONAL
PRESCRIPTION OPIATE CONSULTANT
LITIGATION**

MDL No. 2996

SCHEDULE CTO-35 – TAG-ALONG ACTIONS

<u>DIST</u>	<u>DIV.</u>	<u>C.A.NO.</u>	<u>CASE CAPTION</u>	
ALABAMA NORTHERN				
ALN	6	22-01384	Winston County, Alabama v. McKinsey and Company Inc	
ALABAMA SOUTHERN				
ALS	1	22-00432	The City of Gulf Shores, Alabama v. McKinsey and Company, Inc.	
CALIFORNIA EASTERN				
CAE	2	22-01999	City of Chico, California v. McKinsey and Company, Inc.	
MARYLAND				
MD	1	22-02842	Baltimore County, Maryland v. McKinsey and Company, Inc.	
MD	1	22-02916	Anne Arundel County, Maryland v. McKinsey and Company, Inc.	
MD	8	22-02773	City of Bowie, Maryland v. McKinsey and Company, Inc.	
NEW YORK SOUTHERN				
NYS	7	22-ap-07044	Alma, Georgia et al v. McKinsey & Company, Inc. et al	
NYS	7	22-ap-07045	Bayonne, New Jersey et al v. McKinsey & Company, Inc. et al	
NORTH DAKOTA				
ND	3	22-00190	Cass County v. McKinsey and Company, Inc.	
WASHINGTON WESTERN				
WAW	2	22-01544	City of Seattle v. McKinsey & Co Inc et al	
WEST VIRGINIA SOUTHERN				
WVS	2	22-00471	S. U. et al v. Johnson & Johnson et al	Opposed 11/28/2022
WVS	2	22-00472	J. A. H. et al v. Johnson & Johnson et al	Opposed 11/28/2022
WVS	2	22-00473	L. M. H. et al v. Johnson & Johnson et al	Opposed 11/28/2022
WVS	2	22-00474	A. L. K. et al v. Johnson & Johnson et al	Opposed 11/28/2022

WVS	2	22-00475	S.W. et al v. Johnson & Johnson et al	Opposed 11/28/2022
WVS	2	22-00476	K.A.D. et al v. Johnson & Johnson et al	Opposed 11/28/2022
WVS	2	22-00478	D.R.E. et al v. Johnson & Johnson et al	Opposed 11/28/2022
WVS	2	22-00479	K. B. et al v. Johnson & Johnson et al	Opposed 11/28/2022
WVS	2	22-00480	A.B.F. et al v. Johnson & Johnson et al	Opposed 11/28/2022
WVS	2	22-00481	M. B. et al v. Johnson & Johnson et al	Opposed 11/28/2022
WVS	2	22-00482	A.S.A. et al v. Johnson & Johnson et al	Opposed 11/28/2022
WVS	2	22-00483	M. B. et al v. Johnson & Johnson et al	Opposed 11/28/2022
WVS	2	22-00484	M. E. B. et al v. Johnson & Johnson et al	Opposed 11/28/2022
WVS	2	22-00485	M. B. et al v. Johnson & Johnson et al	Opposed 11/28/2022
WVS	2	22-00487	A. S. A. et al v. Johnson & Johnson et al	Opposed 11/28/2022